

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,564	06/05/2006	Salvatore Avolio	ITT0055P	4316
210 MERCK AND	7590 12/1	EXAM	IINER	
P O BOX 2000	•	LOEWE, S	LOEWE, SUN JAE Y	
RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	-				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/551,564	AVOLIO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Sun Jae Y. Loewe	1626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	 Itely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). 			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Oc	<u>ctober 2005</u> .				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6 and 8-11 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11 are subject to restriction	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

10/551,564 Art Unit: 1626

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a national stage application of PCTGB04/01437. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11 are pending in the instant application. Claims 4 and 7 were cancelled by preliminary amendment filed on October 3, 2005.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Group I, claim(s) 1-3, 5, 10 and 11 drawn to products of Formula Ia wherein $X^2=CR^3$. Further election of a single compound is required.
- II. Group II, claim(s) 1-3, 5, 10 and 11 drawn to products of Formula I not covered by Group I. Further election of a single compound is required. Further restriction may apply.
- III. Group III, claim(s) 6 and 9 drawn to process of using products of Group I. Further election of a single compound is required.
- IV. Group IV, claim(s) 6 and 9 drawn to process of using products of Group II. Further election of a single compound is required. Further restriction may apply.
- V. Group V, claim(s) 8 drawn to process of making products of Group I. Further election of a single compound is required.
- VI. Group V, claim(s) 8 drawn to process of making products of Group II. Further election of a single compound is required. Further restriction may apply.

10/551,564 Art Unit: 1626

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons.

The technical feature linking the subject matter of Groups I-VI is indole attached indirectly to –C(O)N-. All other structural features are <u>variables</u>, and thus do not constitute a linking technical feature. The core structure is taught in the prior art, eg. see compounds of Gluud (1915).

4. This application contains Markush claims directed to more than one species. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: compounds encompassed by Formula I obtained by varying the substituents to the core structure.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species <u>within the elected</u>

group to which the claims shall be restricted if no Markush claim is finally held to be allowable.

The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a Markush claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

10/551,564 Art Unit: 1626

limitations of an allowed Markush claim (MPEP 803.02). If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

- 5. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11 encompass species described in section 4.
- 6. The species described within section 4 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the reason provided in section 3.
- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species <u>and</u> invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention and species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number:

10/551,564 Art Unit: 1626

- 8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so

Application/Control Number:

10/551,564

Art Unit: 1626

Page 6

may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is

withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sun Jae Y. Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 272-9074.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)272-0699. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sun Jae Y. Loewe

Art Unit 1626

REBECCA ANDERSON

PRIMARY EXAMINER